

### REMARKS

Claims 10-19 and Claim 21 are allowed. Claims 1-9 and 20 are rejected. Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agrawal (U.S. Patent 5,530,912) in view of Scholoeffield (U.S. Patent 6,216,006). Claims 4-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agrawal, Scholoeffield, and Jiang (U.S. Patent 6,535,742). Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agrawal, Scholoeffield, and McCarthy (U.S. Patent 6,181,941).

Applicant traverses these rejections. However, in order to expedite prosecution of the application, Claims 1-9 and 20 have been cancelled.

Independent Claims 10 and 21 were allowed in the first office action. Claims 11-19 were also allowed in the first office action. Claims 11, 12, and 14 have been amended, but only for technical reasons, and thus the doctrine of equivalents applies to all original claims 10-19 and 21.

Independent Claim 21 has been allowed. Claims 22-29 depend on allowed independent Claim 21, and are thus also allowable.

It is respectfully submitted that Claims 10-19, and 21-29 are now in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. If any issues remain to be resolved, the Examiner is cordially invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Yoon S. Ham

Reg. No. 45,307

Direct Tel.: (202) 861-3871

Piper Rudnick LLP  
P.O. Box 9271,  
Reston, VA 20195